

1 **COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS**
2 **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH**
3 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY (RTP)**

4
5 **DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE EDUCATION**
6 **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY (RTP)**

7
8
9 Candidates must read the CSULB and College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics RTP
10 Policies. These policies, along with the Science Education RTP Policy, shall guide candidates
11 and their evaluators in documenting their achievements and growth as faculty members at
12 California State University, Long Beach.

13
14 The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Policy of the College of Natural
15 Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) establishes college-wide standards of excellence
16 and accompanying criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty within the
17 college for sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 of the university RTP policy (PS 09-10), but
18 readers should still consult the university policy for these sections.¹

19
20 **1. GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION**
21 **(RTP)**

22
23 CNSM faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the
24 impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and
25 instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA);
26 and 3) service to the department, college, university, community, and the profession.
27 All CNSM faculty members will be evaluated on their accomplishments in all three
28 areas.

29
30 Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions in all three
31 areas. Tenure and promotion recommendations are based on a candidate
32 demonstrating a sustained record of quality performance over the period of review and
33 evidence leading to the belief that a candidate will continue making productive
34 contributions in all three areas of evaluation. Reappointment decisions are based on
35 evidence that a candidate is making good progress in establishing a record of evidence
36 that will meet requirements for tenure and promotion.

37
38 **2. RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

39
40 Departments in the CNSM are responsible for defining the specific standards of
41 excellence in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, scholarly,
42 and creative activities; and 3) professional service and engagement at the university, in

¹ Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with the Unit 3 (Faculty) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This policy should not be considered as a substitute, however, for those parts of the agreement that affect RTP matters.

43 the community, and in the profession and for providing accompanying criteria for
44 reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consistent with the college and university RTP
45 policies. The departmental standards cannot be lower than the college standards.
46 Candidates for RTP recommendations are rated as excellent, competent, or deficient in
47 each category of evaluation. The RTP policy of each department must provide specific
48 standards and criteria for the ratings of excellent and competent in each area of
49 evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. A candidate will not receive a
50 positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if rated as deficient (does not meet
51 requirements for competent) in any area. In order to be recommended for tenure or
52 promotion to associate professor, a candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area
53 of instruction and instructionally related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly
54 and creative activities. In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to
55 full professor, candidates must receive at least one rating of excellent in one of the
56 areas of evaluation.

57

58 **2.1. Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

59 Faculty members are expected to be effective teachers and provide evidence of this
60 effectiveness in their files. Instruction and instructionally related activities include
61 teaching and fostering learning inside and outside the traditional classroom (classroom,
62 laboratory, and field). Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to,
63 curriculum development, academic and departmental advising, supervision of student
64 research and fieldwork, and related activities involving student learning and student
65 engagement. Additional instructional activities may include, but are not limited to,
66 student mentoring, study abroad, and thesis and project supervision.

67

68 Faculty members in the Department of Science Education are expected to be effective teachers
69 and advisors, and to participate in professional development activities. Effective teaching is
70 characterized by developing appropriate student learning outcomes, engaging students with
71 appropriate and varied pedagogies, using a variety of assessment techniques, critically analyzing
72 one's teaching, and reflecting on constructive feedback. Candidates are expected to remain
73 current in their content knowledge, teach meaningful lessons, and strive to continually improve
74 their instructional effectiveness. Candidates should describe in their narrative how they have met
75 these expectations. A description of the sorts of evidence that could be included can be found in
76 section 2.2.

77

78 2.1.1. Instructional Philosophy and Practice

79 Faculty members are expected to maintain currency and exhibit mastery of the subject
80 matter in their instruction and instructionally related materials. In addition, faculty
81 members are expected to reflect thoughtfully upon their teaching practices and on ways
82 to assess the effectiveness of their instruction on student learning, which may lead to
83 adoption of new or alternative teaching methodologies in both classroom and non-
84 classroom teaching duties. Instructional methods and approaches should be consistent
85 with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate individual student learning
86 styles.

87

88 2.1.1.1. Pedagogical approach and method

89 The scholarly rigor of the courses should be comparable to the same or similar courses
90 taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty in the discipline. Course materials and
91 teaching methods should reflect currency in the field, be appropriate to the topic, and be
92 of value in facilitating learning. Materials submitted by a candidate in her/his file should
93 include at least course syllabi and assessment materials. Teaching materials, such as
94 samples of student work with instructor feedback, should also be submitted when
95 available. Course materials should clearly convey to the students the learning goals
96 and the relationship of the course to the major and to the broader discipline. At a
97 minimum, each course taught by the candidate should prepare the students for later
98 courses for which the course in question is a prerequisite. Course policies and grading
99 practices should be clearly conveyed to students, and the results of grading practices
100 should be reasonably consistent with department norms for the same or comparable
101 courses taught by other tenured/tenure-track faculty. The most recent syllabus from
102 each course taught during the evaluation period must be included.

103
104 2.1.1.2. Ongoing professional development as a teacher
105 There should be ongoing evidence that the candidate takes an active role in refreshing
106 her/his courses, maintaining their currency, and enhancing the teaching approaches
107 used by assessing her/his effectiveness in the classroom. These assessments should
108 be based on student evaluations, peer reviews, and/or other methods adopted by the
109 candidate. The candidate should make thoughtful, deliberate, and planned effort toward
110 a continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. This pattern of change over time
111 should be described by the candidate in the narrative and supported with relevant
112 materials. This record may include interactions with colleagues on pedagogy,
113 classroom visits, consultations on course improvement, involvement in programs of the
114 Faculty Center for Professional Development, participation in teaching seminars or
115 conferences, giving or receiving pedagogical coaching, and other activities that
116 contribute to the development of teaching effectiveness.

117
118 2.1.2. Student Learning Outcomes
119 Faculty members should provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices
120 and course materials should clearly convey expected student learning outcomes and
121 goals. Instructional practices and assessment methods should be consistent with
122 course goals.

123
124 2.1.3. Student Response to Instruction
125 In addition to evidence of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and
126 university RTP policies, student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student
127 response to instruction. Course evaluation summary pages must be included for all
128 courses evaluated during the period under review. Note that evaluations for
129 independent or directed study courses (e.g. 496, 697, or 698) or department
130 seminar/colloquium courses should not be included in the candidate's file. Student
131 course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.
132 Utilization of the university standard evaluation form is only one method of assessing
133 student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item

134 on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does
135 not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness.

136
137 Student ratings of instruction should be compared with department and college means
138 and taken in context with all other criteria, such as difficulty of course concepts and
139 material, comprehensive coverage of the subject, and course rigor. These numerical
140 ratings, and other student input to the RTP committee, reflect the effectiveness of the
141 instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to
142 student needs.

143

144 **2.2. Evaluation for Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities**

145 Assessment of teaching effectiveness shall be based on peer evaluation of appropriate
146 materials in the candidate's RTP file, peer observation of teaching, and on student
147 course evaluation forms for all courses evaluated since the last promotion or since
148 appointment. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be based on the quality
149 of teaching performance over time across all of the courses assigned to the candidate.

150

151 Candidates should provide evidence of instructional effectiveness, student learning, and efforts
152 to improve instruction. Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are described through the
153 narrative, with supporting documentation. Candidates should discuss instructional improvements
154 they have made, as well as the rationale leading to those changes. Supporting documentation also
155 provides evidence of the changes. Modifications to instruction made as a result of feedback from
156 prior reviews are expected. Candidates should address these changes in their narrative.

157 Candidates should refer to the CNSM RTP Policy in regards to which instructionally related
158 artifacts must be included in the file.

159

160 2.2.1. Evaluators should examine the narrative for 1) the candidate's response to
161 suggestions for improvement from prior RTP reviews (both RTP and mini evaluations),
162 2) comments on any changes in teaching evaluation scores, 3) explanations of
163 circumstances that might mitigate unfavorable evaluations or student responses, and 4)
164 any additional information provided that may be of assistance in evaluating the
165 candidate's teaching effectiveness.

166

167 2.2.2. Evaluators should critically assess grading standards as well as the scholarly
168 rigor of courses taught. The frame of reference shall be the same or similar courses
169 taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty.

170

171 2.2.3. Evaluators should carefully review all evaluations of teaching effectiveness,
172 including a critical analysis of all student input. This analysis must assess the
173 significance of the candidate's student course evaluation data.

174

175 2.2.4. Emphasis in the peer evaluation of a candidate's course materials and
176 content should be based on the quality of the materials and on their value in facilitating
177 the learning process.

178

179 2.2.5. As part of the review process, a minimum of four class visits shall be made by
180 at least two members of the department RTP committee. These class visits must be
181 conducted during the semester in which the review takes place (unless the candidate is
182 not teaching at CSULB that semester; in this case, the visitations from the prior year
183 shall be used). The candidate should be informed that the visits normally will occur
184 during the open period. The candidate will receive notice of at least five days prior to
185 the start of classroom visits, but otherwise visits will be unannounced. The candidate
186 may submit course syllabi or otherwise notify the RTP committee when tests or other
187 activities are scheduled to permit the committee to choose most appropriate days for
188 visits. The committee members' evaluations of the candidate in the classroom should
189 address such factors as instructional clarity, communication with the students, student
190 engagement, presentation style, effective use of classroom time, currency and mastery
191 of subject matter, effectiveness of course materials, and, if used, audiovisual and
192 electronic media or demonstrations. Written reports based on class visits must be
193 placed in the candidate's RTP file with a copy to the candidate. The signed reports
194 must include times and dates of the visits.

195
196 2.2.6. If applicable, evaluators should assess the mentoring activities of the
197 candidate in supervisory courses.

198
199 2.2.7. If the candidate engages in formal student advising and receives assigned
200 time for this activity, he/she should provide the RTP committee with evidence of this
201 effort and should address in her/his narrative the effectiveness of this advising in
202 meeting student needs.

203
204 2.2.8. Examples of Products/Activities

205 The college recognizes that there is a variety of activities that fulfill, complement, and
206 complete a candidate's file with regards to instructionally related activities. The list
207 below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the
208 possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP committee in this category.

209
210 2.2.8.1. Demonstration of innovative approaches to classroom or field teaching;

211
212 2.2.8.2. Publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, and study guides;

213
214 2.2.8.3. Substantial participation in the supervision of student research, thesis
215 research supervision, and the preparation of students for the presentation
216 of such research;

217
218 2.2.8.4. Obtaining external funding for teaching projects or instructional
219 laboratories;

220
221 2.2.8.5. Academic advising, if it is a significant contribution and is part of the
222 candidate's assigned workload, and mentoring of students;

223
224 2.2.8.6. Organization and participation in scholarly activities for students;

- 225
226 2.2.8.7. Development of novel curricular materials, including multimedia and
227 computer-based materials;
228
229 2.2.8.8. Participating in workshops, such as those offered by the Faculty Center for
230 Professional Development or professional societies, for the purpose of
231 improving instruction; and
232
233 2.2.8.9. Attending, developing, and offering workshops, colloquia, and other
234 forums for the dissemination of new techniques and the demonstration of
235 novel teaching methods to faculty colleagues.
236
237 2.2.9. All candidates must include in their RTP files:
238
239 2.2.9.1. Student course evaluation summary pages for all courses evaluated;
240
241 2.2.9.2. Representative syllabi (not including syllabi from multiple iterations of the
242 same course unless the course has significantly changed over time);
243
244 2.2.9.3. Samples of assessments such as assignments, tests, projects, and
245 homework sets; and,
246
247 2.2.9.4. If appropriate for the course, a sample of instructor feedback provided to
248 students (e.g. a copy of a scored student paper with feedback).
249
250 2.2.10. Department RTP policies may require additional artifacts for inclusion.
251
252 2.2.11. Ongoing professional development in the discipline
253 Candidates should present evidence that they have kept abreast of developments in the
254 discipline and applied these in their instruction as appropriate. Currency can be most
255 directly achieved through maintaining an active program of research or scholarly
256 activity. Attendance and participation in discipline-specific conferences and reading of
257 appropriate discipline journals and books will also be considered.
258

259 **2.2.12 Criteria for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor**

260 **i. Rating of Competent**

261 A rating of competent for tenure or promotion to associate professor requires knowledge of the
262 skills and concepts taught, pedagogical content knowledge, attention to student learning, and
263 effectiveness as an instructor. Successful candidates will document how they have worked to
264 improve their instructional effectiveness, their work with students in a variety of settings to
265 enhance student learning and growth, and participation (as a learner) in at least one
266 instructionally related professional development activity per year.
267

268 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

269 To earn a rating of excellent, candidates must provide evidence of consistently high quality
270 teaching in the classroom with multiple artifacts to support the claims. Candidates must have

271 significant involvement in instructionally related activities beyond their own courses as defined
272 in the CNSM policy as delineated in section 2.2.8. Candidates provide evidence of how the
273 annual professional development impacts their own instruction. Successful candidates will
274 document how they have worked to improve their instructional effectiveness, their work with
275 students in a variety of settings to enhance student learning and growth, and participation (as a
276 learner) in at least one instructionally related professional development activity per year
277

278 **2.2.13 Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

279 **i. Rating of Competent**

280 Successful candidates will document how they have worked to improve their instructional
281 effectiveness, their work with students in a variety of settings to enhance student learning and
282 growth, and participation (as a learner) in at least one instructionally related professional
283 development activity per year. A rating of competent for promotion to professor requires
284 evidence of a sustained record of teaching effectiveness as well as a record of continued efforts
285 to remain current in subjects associated with the faculty member's teaching responsibilities.
286 Faculty should take a leadership role in helping to support best-practice teaching and learning
287 outside their own courses at local, regional or national levels.
288

289 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

290 Successful candidates will document how they have worked to improve their instructional
291 effectiveness, their work with students in a variety of settings to enhance student learning and
292 growth, and participation (as a learner) in at least one instructionally related professional
293 development activity per year. To earn a rating of excellent, candidates must show evidence of
294 consistently high quality teaching in the classroom with multiple artifacts to support the claims.
295 Candidates must have significant involvement in instructionally related activities beyond their
296 own courses as defined in the CNSM policy. Candidates provide evidence of how the annual
297 professional development activities impact their own instruction.
298

299 **2.3. Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

301 **2.3.1. Specific CNSM Requirements in RSCA**

302
303 College faculty must be engaged in ongoing productive programs of RSCA that
304 demonstrate intellectual and professional growth in their disciplines. All faculty
305 members are expected to produce peer-reviewed RSCA achievements that contribute
306 to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines and that are
307 disseminated to appropriate audiences. Candidates should refer to their respective
308 department policies for definitions and criteria for evaluation of RSCA. Department
309 standards may be higher than college-level standards. Candidates for tenure must
310 develop an independent research program at CSULB that results in peer-reviewed
311 publications in which the candidate is identified as the senior investigator. The
312 candidate's narrative should provide a clear description of the quality and value of the
313 candidate's scholarly activity and this narrative must identify the candidate's
314 responsibility and intellectual contribution to particular research projects. A candidate's
315 research program must be conducted to a substantial degree as a member of the
316 faculty at CSULB. Research collaborations are encouraged and departments must
317 define how they are to be evaluated and meet the publication requirement. The

318 department RTP policy shall provide specific additional departmental requirements in
319 research and shall list discipline-specific criteria used in evaluating RSCA. Candidates
320 for promotion to full professor must have a record of RSCA activity after their promotion
321 to associate professor that results in peer-reviewed RSCA products.

322
323 Science education as a field is interdisciplinary with collaborations across departments, colleges,
324 campuses, educational levels, and venues. The Department of Science Education values
325 collaboration and recognizes that it takes time to build collaborative endeavors. Collaborative
326 endeavors often result in end-products that are of higher quality and value than products
327 developed individually. Candidates must clearly describe their roles in collaborative endeavors
328 and their contributions to published products. Candidates who do not have two research
329 publications in which they are identified as a senior investigator (first author) must document
330 equivalent contributions via letters from collaborators detailing their contributions.

331

332

333 2.3.2. Evaluation For RSCA

334

335 2.3.2.1. The quality of faculty research performance is the most important RSCA
336 element to consider for reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations. The
337 candidate's narrative should explain the significance of activities in this category. The
338 evaluators will assess all materials submitted by the candidate by applying specific
339 RSCA criteria established in the departmental RTP policy. The candidate's
340 documentation and the review of it will focus on continuing professional development,
341 and this theme should be the central organizing element of the candidate's narrative.
342 The narrative is intended to serve as a coherent guide to evaluators in understanding
343 the candidate's intellectual and professional achievements in this category, the nature of
344 student involvement in the candidate's RSCA (if applicable), and how the candidate
345 places this work in relation to the evaluation criteria described in the department,
346 college, and university RTP policies.

347

348 2.3.2.2. The candidate is urged to identify, within the materials submitted,
349 examples of the candidate's best work along with an explanation of why these materials
350 should be regarded as significant contributions. Reviewers will give particular
351 consideration to the quality of these examples. For jointly authored activities the
352 candidate must identify the specific extent of her/his participation. Documentation from
353 at least one senior co-author regarding these contributions is strongly recommended if
354 the candidate only has co-authored publications.

355

356 2.3.2.3. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained. The
357 documentation should include all works produced during the period subject to RTP
358 review. Any manuscripts cited as in progress in the narrative must be included in the
359 supplementary documentation binder.

360

361 2.3.2.4. External evaluations of the candidate's contributions to the discipline will
362 be considered, consistent with the provisions of the current CBA and university policy.

363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408

2.3.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to RSCA

Candidates are expected to be involved in multiple RSCA related activities beyond the peer review publication expectations defined by the departments for tenure and promotion. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by RTP evaluators in this category. Peer-reviewed RSCA products are given greater weight than non peer-reviewed products.

- 2.3.3.1. Publication of additional peer-reviewed paper(s) in established journals in the area of expertise;
- 2.3.3.2. Publication of a peer-reviewed book or a chapter in a peer-reviewed book;
- 2.3.3.3. Successful involvement of students in ongoing RSCA, e.g., co-authorship of publications and presentations with students as evidenced by student presentations at scientific meetings;
- 2.3.3.4. Scholarly presentations at professional meetings and conferences;
- 2.3.3.5. Awards of peer-reviewed applications for external funding;
- 2.3.3.6. Applications for external funds to support ongoing RSCA;
- 2.3.3.7. Citations of the candidate's work in other authors' peer-reviewed works or in books;
- 2.3.3.8. Applied research or professional activity to address problems of importance to the disciplines and society;
- 2.3.3.9. Awards of internal grants;
- 2.3.3.10. Editorial/reviewer assignments with recognized professional publications or review panels for research grants calling for professional expertise;
- 2.3.3.11. Textbooks, curricula, and instructional technology developed for uses beyond the candidate's own personal teaching; or
- 2.3.3.12. Patents that resulted from the candidate's research or professional activity.

The department RTP policy shall list specific RSCA activities fulfilling departmental criteria for tenure and promotion. These activities shall be peer-reviewed, as appropriate, disseminated to appropriate professional audiences, and make significant contributions to the disciplines or to interdisciplinary studies.

409 **2.3.4 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

410 The Department expects candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor to create a
411 sustained record of research and scholarly work. Candidates shall demonstrate a record of
412 ongoing productivity related to RSCA products throughout the period of review.

413
414 Candidates shall provide evidence that they can communicate with both research and practitioner
415 audiences. In addition to demonstrating ability to communicate with academic peers candidates
416 are expected to share research findings or research based best practices with practitioners so that
417 the finding will be implemented.

418
419 Examples of RSCA products are delineated in the CNSM RTP Policy in section 2.3.3. The
420 candidate shall provide evidence that demonstrates communication to diverse audiences.

421
422 The quality of the candidates' performance and their continuing productivity are the primary
423 criteria for evaluation. Candidates bear primary responsibilities for explaining the significance of
424 activities in this category. Candidates should include drafts of work under review as well as other
425 products in progress that are discussed in the narrative.

426
427 **i. Rating of Competent**

428 To earn a rating of competent, candidates will have at least two peer-reviewed, research
429 publications with results of research based on data generated while a faculty member at CSULB,
430 one of which must be a research article. The other could be published in a practitioner-oriented
431 publication. Faculty members are expected to present at least one peer-reviewed presentation
432 every other year. Additionally candidates must also have evidence of peer-reviewed RSCA
433 products focused for the practitioner audience. The deadline for meeting these requirements is
434 the deadline for the submission of the file to the department RTP committee.

435
436 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

437 To earn a rating of excellent candidates must have at least eleven peer-reviewed RSCA products,
438 four of which must be publications (at least two of the publications must be based on research
439 generated at CSULB and at least one must be in a research journal written for research
440 colleagues). The candidate must present at least one presentation every other year. Candidates
441 shall provide evidence of peer-reviewed RSCA products that are focused for the practitioner
442 audience.

443
444 **2.3.5 Promotion to Professor**

445 Candidates for promotion to professor must show continued productivity. The quality of the
446 candidates' performance and their record of productivity are the primary criteria for evaluation

447
448 **i. Rating of Competent**

449 To earn a rating of competent for promotion to professor candidates shall have a minimum of
450 two peer-reviewed publications since promotion to associate professor, one of which must be a
451 research publication with data generated at CSULB. Faculty members are expected to make an
452 average of one peer-reviewed presentation every other year. Candidates for professor must have
453 served as thesis advisor for at least one master's student through the completion of that student's
454 thesis.

455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500

ii. Rating of Excellent

To earn a rating of excellent candidates must have at least eleven peer-reviewed RSCA products since promotion to associate professor. These include at least three publications, two of which must be based on research generated at CSULB with at least one in a research journal written for research colleagues and an average of one peer-reviewed presentation every other year. Candidates shall provide evidence of peer-reviewed RSCA products that are focused for the practitioner audience. Candidates for professor must have served as thesis advisor for at least two master’s student through the completion of those students’ theses.

2.4. Professional Service

Professional service consists of activities other than teaching and RSCA that result from the candidate’s academic expertise and contribute to the mission of the university. It includes service to the discipline, the department, the college, the university, and the community. The college recognizes that the departments have different expectations with regard to professional service. However, after reappointment, candidates are expected to expand the scope of participation beyond their department, and candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to assume a leadership role in some aspect of professional service.

The candidate's narrative should address the nature, the outcomes, and the contributions of this service to the missions of the university, the college, or the department, and the relationship of this service to the candidate's academic expertise.

Science Education faculty are expected to participate actively in department level governance and responsibilities, which include participation in department seminars, attending thesis defenses and faculty meetings, and coordinating courses and policies within our department and the teacher education programs.

By virtue of the discipline and nature of their position, Science Education faculty members have service responsibilities/opportunities that regularly expand beyond the department and campus community. Service is a critical aspect of a Science Education faculty member’s assignment. It is likely that faculty members will be involved in service throughout the university as well as outreach and collaboration with educational partners outside our campus.

2.4.1. Criteria for Professional Service

Faculty must participate actively in faculty governance through active involvement on committees at the department and college levels to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Faculty being considered for promotion to full professor must demonstrate significant service at the college, university, or CSU system level. A candidate's service to her/his respective profession will be given consideration. The quality of service is the primary consideration, rather than mere membership on a number of committees.

501 2.4.2. Evaluation of Professional Service
502 The emphasis in the evaluation of professional service shall be on: 1) the quality and
503 significance of the activity, as measured by the degree to which the activity contributes
504 to the missions of the university, the college, and the department; and 2) the extent and
505 level of the candidate's involvement. Paid consultancies shall not normally count toward
506 service. Assessment of the service to both the university and community shall be based
507 on information described in the candidate's narrative, as well as on supporting evidence,
508 which may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda
509 acknowledging the quality of the contribution, or printed programs.

511 2.4.3. Examples of Products/Activities Related to Professional Service
512 The college recognizes that there can be a wide variety of activities classified as
513 professional service. The list below is meant solely to be illustrative and is neither
514 ordered nor exhaustive of the possibilities that may be considered by the college RTP
515 committee in this category.

517 2.4.3.1. Authorship of documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the
518 department, the college, or the university;

520 2.4.3.2. Sponsoring student groups;

522 2.4.3.3. Actively engaging in institutional educational and research programs;

524 2.4.3.4. Service to professional organizations (including refereeing and reviewing);

526 2.4.3.5. Profession-related activities at local, state, national, and international
527 levels through discipline-oriented activities such as committees,
528 workshops, speeches, and media interviews;

530 2.4.3.6. Discipline-related volunteer consultancies to schools, local governments,
531 and community service organizations;

533 2.4.3.7. Membership on selection and review panels for instructional grants,
534 fellowships, awards, conference presentations, and other efforts calling for
535 general expertise in the discipline.

537 **2.4.4 Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor**

538 **i. Rating of Competent**

539 Candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor are expected to participate in standard
540 departmental service (department seminars, thesis defenses, faculty meetings, and course
541 coordination) plus an average of at least one other service activity every year during the
542 probationary period. In addition, candidates must serve on a college, university, or professional
543 committee for at least one year (see CNSM policy for examples).

545 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

546 To earn a rating of excellent candidates must meet the minimum service requirements for
547 reappointment/promotion. In addition, candidates must either serve at least one year in a
548 leadership position in a college, university, or professional committee or they must serve in
549 multiple service roles beyond the minimum requirements for reappointment/promotion.
550 Candidates bear the responsibilities for clarifying the nature of their participation and leadership.

551

552 **2.4.5 Promotion to Professor**

553 **i. Rating of Competent**

554 To earn a rating of competent for promotion to professor, candidates are required to participate in
555 an average of at least one extra-departmental service activity every two years since promotion or
556 appointment to associate professor. Candidates must demonstrate continued service to the
557 department as described above. In addition, promotion to professor requires leadership in at least
558 one college, university, or CSU system committee for at least one year or they must serve in
559 multiple service roles beyond the minimum required for promotion.

560

561 **ii. Rating of Excellent**

562 To earn a rating of excellent candidates must exceed the minimum service requirements for
563 promotion to professor. Candidates record of service can include both on-campus and off-
564 campus activities. In addition, candidates must either serve at least one year in a leadership
565 position in a college, university, or professional committee. Candidates bear the responsibilities
566 for making the case for their participation and leadership.

567

568

569 **3. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

570 Candidates should consult the university RTP policy.

571

572 **3.1.** The CNSM candidate's narrative should also include plans and goals for the
573 coming five years and a discussion of how the candidate has addressed suggestions
574 made during previous reviews.

575

576 **3.2.** Department chairs are strongly encouraged to write evaluations of all RTP
577 candidates unless the department chair is elected to the department RTP committee.
578 Such chair evaluations must be independent of the department RTP committee's
579 evaluation. However, in promotion considerations, a department chair must have a
580 higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a
581 review or participate on a review committee. In no case may a department chair
582 participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

583

584 **3.3** The Department of Science Education RTP Committee shall consist of three members
585 elected by secret ballot from among the department's tenured faculty. If there are not three
586 eligible faculty members the committee will be filled by a faculty member from a related
587 department if elected by the tenured and probationary faculty in the Department.

588

589 All department probationary and tenured faculty members are eligible to vote and may vote for
590 any number of candidates up to the number of open slots. The faculty members receiving the
591 highest number of votes in the secret ballot will join the department RTP committee. The three

592 members shall serve one year terms with annual elections. If an elected member resigns or
593 otherwise cannot complete the term of service for which he/she was elected, the department will
594 elect a replacement to serve the rest of the term.

595
596

597 **4. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS**

598 Consult the university RTP policy.

599

600 **5. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

601

602 **5.1. Reappointment Consideration for Probationary Faculty**

603

604 5.1.1. The candidate must demonstrate significant progress towards tenure. Based
605 upon criteria established by the department and the college, a candidate for
606 reappointment must show evidence of quality in all three areas of evaluation.

607

608 5.1.2. The candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate effective
609 teaching responsive to the learning needs of CSULB's diverse body of students and to
610 the university's educational mission. The candidate is expected to show progress in
611 her/his program of ongoing RSCA and to have produced initial scholarly and creative
612 achievements. The candidate is expected to have made service contributions primarily
613 at the departmental level consistent with departmental and college service expectations.

614

615 **5.2. Awarding of Tenure**

616 Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member and is
617 awarded when the candidate has demonstrated ongoing and increasingly distinguished
618 professional contributions to the university and to the profession. Tenure
619 recommendations are based on the positive evaluation of the quality of the candidate's
620 overall record of accomplishments at CSULB and a demonstrated potential for the
621 continuation of this record.

622

623 **5.3. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

624

625 5.3.1. For review of an assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate
626 professor normally are awarded together. Tenure is awarded to probationary faculty
627 members who have met the department, college, and university criteria in instruction
628 and instructionally related activities, RSCA, and professional service. A candidate will
629 not receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion if deficient in any area.
630 For a positive recommendation of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a
631 candidate must earn a rating of excellent in the area of instruction and instructionally
632 related activities **or** in the area of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

633

634 5.3.2. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to
635 be effective teachers. Activities used in assessing excellence in teaching are listed in
636 sections 2.2.8 of this policy.

637

638 5.3.3. The overall trajectory of the candidate’s research program must demonstrate
639 that the candidate will continue making increasingly distinguished contributions in
640 RSCA. Activities used in assessing excellence in research are listed in sections 2.3.3 of
641 this policy. The department RTP policy must also provide specific criteria in RSCA for
642 tenure and promotion to associate professor along with the departmental standards for
643 assessment of the quality of the candidate’s accomplishments. All levels of review will
644 use these departmental criteria in conjunction with the college and university criteria.
645

646 5.3.4. Candidates are expected to have made high-quality service contributions to
647 the university or the expanded community. Activities used in assessing excellence in
648 service are listed in section 2.4.3 of this policy.
649

650 **5.4. Promotion to Professor**

651
652 5.4.1. Overall standards for promotion to full professor shall be higher than those for
653 tenure and promotion to associate professor and must be clearly defined in the
654 departmental RTP policy. A full professor is expected to demonstrate a consistent
655 record of effectiveness in teaching, student engagement, and course or curricular
656 development. The successful candidate will have a proven program of RSCA that
657 includes high quality contributions to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of
658 her/his discipline or interdisciplinary fields of study. The candidate is expected to have
659 disseminated a substantial body of peer-reviewed work at the national or international
660 level. In addition, a full professor shall have provided significant service and leadership
661 at the university and in the community or the profession.
662

663 5.4.2. A candidate will not receive a positive recommendation for promotion if
664 deficient in any area. In order to be recommended for promotion to professor, a
665 candidate must earn at least one rating of excellent in one of the areas of evaluation.
666

667 **5.5. Early Tenure or Early Promotion**

668 Consult the university RTP policy.
669

670 **6. STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

671 Consult the university RTP policy.
672

673 **7. ADDITIONAL PROCESSES**

674
675 All information in this policy applies to faculty appointed jointly to two or more
676 departments. The involved departments must maintain a clear set of requirements for
677 tenure and advancement as applied to the joint appointee. These requirements must
678 be worked out through a process of consultation and collaboration among the
679 departments and the candidate at the time of appointment, with the approval of the
680 dean(s).
681

682 **8. CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RTP POLICY**

683

684 **8.1.** Changes to CSULB RTP policies and procedures may occur as a result of
685 changes to the CBA. Additionally, campus administrators may make certain procedural
686 changes to accommodate the university calendar or other campus needs. In general,
687 changes to procedures do not require a vote by the faculty.

688
689 **8.2.** The tenured/tenure-track faculty of the college, voting by secret ballot (with pro
690 and con arguments attached), may recommend an amendment to the policy and
691 evaluation criteria section of this policy.

692
693 **8.3.** Amendments may be proposed by either of the following:

694
695 8.3.1. A direct faculty action via petition from ten percent (10%) of the
696 tenured/tenure-track faculty or

697
698 8.3.2. By action of the CNSM council.

699
700 **8.4.** Proposed amendments shall be submitted for discussion at a public hearing for
701 the faculty called within fifteen (15) instructional days following their receipt and shall be
702 distributed by the chair of the college council to the faculty at least five (5) instructional
703 days before the public hearing.

704
705 **8.5.** Amendments to this policy shall become effective when they have received a
706 favorable vote of a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty voting in a secret ballot
707 conducted by the college council within twenty (20) instructional days of the public
708 hearing and they have the concurrence of the college dean and the university president
709 or designee.

710 711 **8.6 Amendments to the Department RTP Policy**

712
713 Proposed amendments to the department RTP policy shall be submitted in writing to the
714 department chair to be discussed at a department meeting within fifteen (15) instructional days of
715 their receipt. The proposed amendments will be distributed by the chair to the department at least
716 five (5) instructional days before the department meeting at which they will be discussed.

717
718 Voting on amendment(s) shall be by secret ballot by the tenured and probationary faculty. To be
719 effective, proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible tenured
720 and probationary voters and be approved by the college council, the dean and the provost.

721
722 The approved amendment(s) shall go into effect at the beginning of the following academic year.

723
724 College RTP Policy approved by CNSM faculty February 23, 2010.

725 Approved by Academic Affairs February 24, 2010.

726
727 Effective: Fall 2010

728
729 02/23/10 – CNSM RTP Policy approved by vote of the CNSM faculty

730 11/10/10 – Science Education RTP Policy approved by the College Council